



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/577,734	05/23/2000	Kouji Takagi	13624	3883

7590

07/02/2002

Paul J Esatto Jr
Scully Scott Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza
Garden City, NY 11530

EXAMINER

DUONG, THOI V

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2871

DATE MAILED: 07/02/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/577,734

Applicant(s)

TAKAGI, KOUJI

Examiner

Thoi V Duong

Art Unit

2871

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 April 2002.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 8 and 14 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-7 and 9-13 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner. _____
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Drawings

The corrected or substitute drawings were received on April 18, 2002. These drawings are approved.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

Claims 1, 4, and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroha et al. (USPN 6,028,650) for the same reasons set forth in the last office action.

Claims 2, 3, 6, 7, and 9-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Kuroha et al. as applied to claims 1, 4, and 5 above, in view of Taniguchi et al. (USPN 6,334,689 B1) for the same reasons set forth in the last office action.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed on April 18, 2002 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argued that Kuroha does not disclose, teach or suggest that each gate signal line becomes narrower as the distance from the gate signal input portion becomes larger with respect to claims 1, 4 and 5; and in the present invention recited by claims 1, 4 and 5, brightness of each pixel becomes higher if the luminance of backlighting by a backlight portion is uniform throughout the image screen. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant's remarks because Kuroha actually discloses in the

Art Unit: 2871

Prior Art Figs. 1 and 2 that "in order to reduce the fluctuation of the feed-through voltage from the pixel A to the pixel C in the pixel array PA, the resistances of the gate lines GL0, GL1, ... can be reduced by reducing the width of the gate lines GL0, GL1, ... (col. 3, lines 19-25). The result of the Prior Art is that the area of the aperture is increased, and the capacitance of the auxiliary portion becomes smaller when the width of the gate lines is reduced as the distance from the gate input portion DR1 becomes larger. Accordingly, the brightness of each pixel becomes higher if the luminance of backlighting is uniform throughout the image screen.

With respect to claims 2, 3, 6, 7, and 9-13, Applicant argued that neither Kuroha nor Taniguchi taken alone or in combination, disclose, teach or suggest that an area of an aperture portion of a pixel becomes larger as the distance from the gate signal input portion becomes larger and that Taniguchi does not disclose the inclination of light from a backlight source. The Examiner disagrees with Applicant's remarks since Taniguchi's Prior Art Fig. 3 suggests a display screen with uniform luminance over the whole planar surface thereof by providing an optical scattering layer 3 consisting of a plurality of ink dots 8 whose area is increased as the distance increases from the backlight source 1 to compensate the inclination of light from a backlight source, and the combination of Kuroha's Prior Art and Taniguchi's Prior Art will result in a better uniform luminance distribution due to an increase of an area of an aperture portion of a pixel as well as an area of an ink dot as distance from the gate input portion to the backlight portion becomes larger.

Art Unit: 2871

Conclusion

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Thoi V. Duong at telephone number (703) 308-3171.

Thoi Duong



06/23/2002



William L. Sikes
Supervisory Patent Examiner
Technology Center 2800